



PRESENT:

Mr. F. Wayne Bass, Chairman
Dr. William P. Brown, Vice Chairman
Mr. Russell Gulley
Mr. Sam R. Hassen
Mr. Reuben J. Waller, Jr.
Mr. Kirkland A. Turner, Secretary to the Commission,
Planning Director

ALSO PRESENT:

Ms. Dorothy Jaeckle, Bermuda District Supervisor,
Board of Supervisors
Ms. Marlene Durfee, Matoaca District Supervisor,
Board of Supervisors
Mr. William Dupler, Deputy County Administrator,
Community Development
Mr. George "Bubba" Bowles, Senior Engineer,
Utilities Department
Mr. Michael Janosik, Planning Administrator,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Mr. Glenn E. Larson, Assistant Director, Plans
and Information Section, Planning Department
Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic, Planning Principal and Senior Designer,
Renaissance Planning Group
Ms. Lorna Parkins, Planning Technical Service Manager
Michael Baker Corporation
Mr. Carl D. Schlaudt, Planning Manager, Development
Review Section, Planning Department
Mr. David W. Robinson, Senior Assistant County Attorney,
County Attorney's Office
Ms. Heather Barrar, Principal Planner, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. James K. Bowling, Principal Planner, Advance Planning
and Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. Robert V. Clay, Planning and Special Projects Manager,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Ms. Barbara Fassett, Planning Manager, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. Steven F. Haasch, Principal Planner, Advance Planning and
Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. R. John McCracken, Director,
Transportation Department
Providing a FIRST CHOICE community through excellence in public service

Ms. Pamela Nichols, Clerk to the Commission,
Administration Section, Planning Department
Ms. Emily Masters, Administrative Secretary,
Advance Planning and Research Section, Planning Department
Mr. Steve Simonson, Senior Civil Engineer,
Transportation Department
Mr. Randy Phelps, Principal Engineer,
Utilities Department
Mr. Jesse Smith, Senior Civil Engineer
Transportation Department
Ms. Jane Peterson, Planning and Special Projects Manager,
Development Review Section, Planning Department
Ms. Beverly Rogers, Planning Administrator,
Planning Department
Mr. James Banks, Assistant Director,
Transportation Department
Mr. Scott Flanigan, Senior Water Quality Analyst,
Environmental Engineering Department
Mr. Rick Witt, Assistant Building Official,
Building Inspection Department
Mr. Dave Wolverton, Microcomputer Analyst
Information Systems Technology
Mr. Bill Wright, Assistant Director Engineering,
Utilities Department

WORK SESSION.

Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen, Waller and staff assembled at 1:00 p. m. in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building, 10001 Lori Road Chesterfield, VA, for a work session.

I. CALL TO ORDER.

Mr. Bass called the work session to order in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration building.

II. INVOCATION.

Mr. Bass presented the invocation.

III. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

The Commissioners led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

IV. APPROVAL OF THE MARCH 31 and APRIL 11, 2011 MINUTES.

On motion of Mr. Gulley, seconded by Mr. Waller, the Commission resolved to approve the March 31, 2011 Draft Comprehensive Plan Minutes.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

On motion of Mr. Gulley, seconded by Mr. Waller, the Commission resolved to approve the April 11, 2011 Draft Comprehensive Plan Minutes.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

V. FOLLOW-UP ITEMS.

- **South Central Wastewater Authority Information.**

In response to Mr. Bass' question, Mr. Waller stated that he was working with the Department of Utilities to answer some of the issues he has. Mr. Waller asked where it fits in the long term of Southern and Western parts of the county; and stated that he does not believe there is adequate attention given to this facility.

A. PRESENTATION BY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. John McCracken provided an overview of the concern with the Draft Plan; and stated he would like to see more detailed analysis or reanalysis of proposed land use.

He stated that the draft land uses were more intense and that specific recommendations from the Current Plan were not carried forward in the Draft Plan.

In response to Mr. Waller's question, Mr. McCracken stated he wanted to see a resolution to his concerns now and not later.

Mr. Hassen asked how to make the Draft Plan realistic knowing the minimum Urban Development Area (UDA) is included in the draft plan. Mr. McCracken stated that Mr. Turner and he met with the County Attorney's office to explore options; and it was his preference to have UDA designations without actually developing the area. He stated that he believes that parcel by parcel planning must be done; and also stated that the draft Plan should not be approved if details are not in place.

Mr. McCracken stated that if this is what is done as land use he does not believe that any of these will be supported by the public and need to be certain that this is what the County and community wants. He further stated there is a need to inform the community of what the impacts will be and ask "is this what you want."

In response to Mr. Gulley's question, Mr. McCracken stated that commuter rail is not realistic short term; and that it would be unrealistic to put something hard on paper. He also stated that every instinct says if the County abandons the East/West freeway it will cause regret in the future.

Mr. Gulley stated the presentation was thorough and it confirmed his position that there was a complete disconnect between land use and transportation. He also stated he cannot support the draft Plan if the issues are not fixed.

Mr. McCracken stated that whatever Land Use the Commission decides will drive the infrastructure of the county.

The Commission recessed at 2:46 p.m.

The Commission reconvened at 2:56 p.m.

B. LORNA PARKINS, MICHAEL BAKER CORPORATION – QUESTIONS & ANSWERS.

Ms. Lorna Parkins, consultant from Michael Baker Corporation, began her presentation clarifying the difference between long range and short range planning and examples of where they work best. She stated at the request of the County's Transportation Department, the draft plan was developed at buildout.

Ms. Parkins stated that the current Plan did not consider any redevelopment and that the draft Plan considers the given life cycle of certain developments. She also stated UDA designations included scenario planning exercise; as well as, citizen input.

Mr. Gulley stated that the densities will not work and that the Departments of Utilities and Transportation will not support it. He also asked why bring us a Plan when you know it will not work.

Mr. Vlad Gavrilovic stated that the Board directed staff to take a long range stance when making the draft Plan. He also stated that early on in the process they compared the draft land use pattern to the current land use pattern and that the mission was to take a countywide view.

Ms. Parkins stated that she does not agree that the Plan does not work, that they compared the current Plan to the draft Plan and that the draft Plan was more fiscally responsible.

Mr. Gulley stated that the cost estimates were not given in the plan. Ms. Parkins replied that they are not in the public draft plan but in a separate memo that was made available to the Transportation Department.

Ms. Parkins stated that in mixed use developments those developers are willing to bring more to the table. She also stated that the current land use is dispersed, separating housing from jobs, which increases travel. She stated that the planning team did scenario planning and with the compact scenario the average trip length decreased eleven to eighteen percent. She also stated that the planning team took the Vision from the public and outreach process and used the scenario to test whether the Vision was supported by the scenario and that the Vision is blueprint for how county should grow.

Mr. Gulley stated that when you talk about redevelopment and talk about mixed use centers you are assuming that you are going to put jobs in; and he finds it a contradiction because what comes first is roof tops. He added, when you have enough roof tops then you see more commercial development.

Ms. Parkins stated that if you look at job housing balance within Virginia, Prince William and Chesterfield County are the only characterized as bedroom counties; and the draft Plan is trying to bring commercial and office space.

Mr. Gulley stated the trend has always been roof top, commercial, then industrial last; and in the last twenty years there has not been an influx in number of jobs that other places have, and unless someone has a crystal ball and to show turn around, he does not see the Vision as reality. Mr. Gulley asked why there was such a wide gap between what was in the draft Plan and what was said by the Transportation Department; and why those differences were not ironed out when the draft Plan was being developed.

Ms. Parkins stated that there were at least three (3) answers to Mr. Gulley's question. One (1) was they were bound by the scope and in order to fulfill the Transportation Department's desire for completely addressing the implications of land use on transportation and vice versa, would have entailed more modeling exercises and more detailed analysis not included in the scope of work. She also stated to

address some of the questions throughout the process; they performed additional analysis beyond what was in the scope of the budget. She further stated, because they had to do Land Use and quantify it, the Transportation section was completed last; therefore, there was not as much time as they would have liked for some of the back and forth with the Department of Transportation. She stated there was a consensus that the proposed buildout levels were too high; and that there were scheduling issues once the buildout levels were adjusted. She stated there were extensive discussions relative to the differences between Transportation's desired process, the process in their contract, scope of budget, and what was approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Turner stated there was disconnect because the draft Plan is a buildout plan, and short term studies need to be done to include utilities, facilities, and roads. He also stated the draft Plan will be reviewed every five (5) years.

Dr. Brown stated he agreed there were a number of issues, but does not see them as irresolvable and that the draft Plan will not have the detail the Transportation Department needs and he does not know if the draft Plan needs to have the details of the Thoroughfare Plan. He stated that his primary concern is what will be the recommendation for the Countryside.

Mr. Hassen stated that he agreed with Dr. Brown; however, the biggest decision is whether the Commission is going to accept the Countryside designation and the proposed densities.

Mr. Turner asked Mr. Bowles to respond to Mr. Gulley's comment that the Department of Utilities cannot support the proposed land uses. Mr. George Bowles stated that he believed the statement made was there were areas of the draft Plan specifically the UDAs that current utility infrastructure cannot support. He further stated the Utilities Water and Wastewater Plan will support and supplement the draft Comprehensive Plan.

Dr. Brown asked Mr. Bowles if an eight (8) inch pipe, water or sewer, were installed in a new sub division in 1990 how long would it take if the pipe was breaking so often that it would be more cost effective to replace the pipe completely. Mr. Bowles stated that it would depend of the type of material and workmanship, but it would be around 50-60 years.

Dr. Brown stated that with some of the increased density in the draft plan it could be incorporated with some planning and natural replacement of infrastructure; and it comes back to the difference between short term (20 years) and long term more visionary plan (100-150 years) and he feel that a lot of time is spend talking about long term plan like it is going to happen next week or even in the next decade.

The Commission discussed tabling the review of the Transportation Element until after the review of the Land Use Element and Map. On motion of Mr. Bass, seconded by Dr. Brown, the Commission resolved to table the Transportation Element until after land use categories and maps are discussed, and to complete review of the Housing Element and review Natural and Cultural Resources, and Environmental Quality at their May 5, 2011 work session.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

In response to Mr. Gulley's request, Mr. Dupler stated that the Transportation Department will update the map to include the names of major roads.

Mr. Bass asked Ms. Nichols to poll the Commission on their vote to table discussions on the Transportation Element following the discussion of Land Use and the Land Use Map.

AYES: Messrs. Bass, Brown, Gulley, Hassen and Waller.

VI. TRANSPORTATION.

The Commission will consider this item at a future work session.

VII. HOUSING.

The Commission will consider this item at a future work session.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT.

On motion of Mr. Hassen, seconded by Dr. Brown, the Commission resolved to approve adjournment at 4:58 p.m. to Thursday, May 5, 2011, at 1 p.m., in the Public Meeting Room, Chesterfield County Administration Building, Chesterfield, Virginia.

Chairman/Date

Secretary/Date